UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,654	03/21/2007	Philip Edgar Vasey	760-022	8537

34845   7590   01/05/2011
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP
33 NAGOG PARK
ACTON, MA 01720

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/05/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

handerson@smmalaw.com
officeadmin@smmalaw.com
cmorrissette@smmalaw.com

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/598,654
Filing Date: March 21, 2007
Appellant(s): VASEY, PHILIP EDGAR

Holmes W. Anderson
Reg. No. 37,272
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 25 October 2010 appealing from the Office

action mailed 1 July 2010.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

1-29

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the

subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are

provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in

the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 6314415	Mukherjee	11-2001
EP 1100013	Maes et al.	5-2001

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Maes et al. (EP 1100013, published 16 May 2001, hereafter Maes) and further in view

of Mukherjee (US 6314415, filed 4 November 1998).

As per independent claim 1, Maes discloses a method of generating invocation

sequences of update function to update elements of a form, the method comprising the

steps of:

supplying update functions to a synthesizer (paragraph 0018)

identifying trigger elements from the elements of the form in the update functions that trigger the invocation of the update function (paragraphs 0018 and 0022)

generating an activation network based on the update functions at the synthesizer (paragraphs 0018, 0022, and 0108-0109)

determining the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger element (paragraphs 0018, 0022, and 0108-0109: Here, upon identifying an update function, the CML interpreter determines the CML function to be invoked to handle the update).

Maes fails to disclose update values associated with a question in a questionnaire form used to obtain information to produce a customized document from a template document, the invocation sequence specifying an order in which the update functions are invoked comprising the step of identifying, using the synthesizer, trigger questions from the questions of the questionnaire that trigger the invocation of at least one supplied update functions. However, Mukherjee discloses update values associated with a question in a questionnaire form used to obtain information to produce a customized document from a template document, the invocation sequence specifying an order in which the update functions are invoked comprising the step of identifying, using the synthesizer, trigger questions from the questions of the questionnaire that trigger the invocation of at least one supplied update functions (Figures 3A-3L; column 2, line 19- column 3, line 5: Here, based upon the user's answers to trigger questions within the questionnaire, various other questions become available/disabled). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Mukherjee with Maes, since it would have allowed a user to specify trigger questions across a plurality of templates displayed to users upon various devices.

As per dependent claim 2, Mukherjee discloses wherein the trigger elements are determined by at least one of the value or status of the elements of the form (Figures 3A-3L; column 2, line 19- column 3, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mukherjee with Maes, since it would have allowed a user to answer questions related to previously validated answers.

As per dependent claim 3, Maes discloses wherein the activation network includes cyclic update functions (paragraph 0018).

As per dependent claim 4, Maes discloses exporting the update functions and the invocation sequence to a form render in a readable format (paragraph 0022: Here, the data is sent to a browser in a mark-up language, so that the data may be rendered and displayed to a user in a readable format).

As per dependent claim 5, Maes discloses wherein the update function are validation function (paragraphs 0061-0064 and 0087).

As per dependent claim 6, Maes discloses wherein the update function are activation functions (paragraphs 0110-0117).

As per dependent claim 7, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer is stored on a server computer (paragraph 0017).

As per dependent claim 8, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer is stored on a client computer (paragraph 0017).

As per dependent claim 9, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer forms part of a middleware application, located between a server computer and a client computer (Figure 5a).

As per dependent claim 10, Maes discloses wherein the synthesizer is integrated with the form renderer (paragraph 0022: Here, the synthesizer is incorporated with a browser, which renders the form data).

As per dependent claim 11, Maes discloses wherein the form render is a web browser application (paragraphs 0018 and 0022).

As per dependent claim 12, Maes discloses wherein the update functions are supplied by one of a database engine and a form renderer (paragraph 0061).

As per dependent claim 13, Mukherjee discloses wherein the step of determining the invocation sequence involves determining the order in which the update functions must be executed within the activation network (Figures 3A-3L; column 2, line 19-column 3, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Mukherjee with Maes, since it would have allowed a user to enable/disable necessary/unnecessary questions.

As per dependent claim 14, Maes discloses the method further comprising:

entering data to change the status of a first form element (paragraphs 0022 and 0084: Here, the data may change a default value of a form element)

determining the position of the first form element in the activation network

(paragraphs 0022 and 0084)

triggering the update functions associated with the first form element to update

the status of a second form element (paragraphs 0022 and 0084: Here, if the default

value of 'yes' is changed, the value of a second form element

'travelCenter.hotel.selected' is modified by a user).

As per claim 15, the applicant discloses the limitation substantially similar to

those in claim 1. Claim 15 is similarly rejected.

As per claims 16-29, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to

those in claims 1-14, respectively. Claims 16-29 are similarly rejected.

(10) Response to Argument

The appellant's argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to teach

determining an invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger question by

using an activation network where the update functions update values associated with

questions in a questionnaire form used to obtain information to produce a customized

document from a template document (page 11).

To support this argument, the appellant argues that prior art fail to disclose,

"determining an invocation sequence of update functions for trigger questions by using

an activation network (pages 13-15)." However, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Maes teaches determining the invocation sequence of update functions for each trigger

element by using an activation network (paragraphs 0018, 0022, 0061, and 0108-0109).

Maes teaches providing a user with a list of options, and receiving a user input
(paragraph 0061). Based upon the received input, the next element in the sequence is
determined and provided to the user (paragraph 0061). In the instance of ordering a
drink, a user may be queried to provide his/her age. Once the user provides his/her
age, the sequence of questions is updated to disable or restrict questions from the
sequence (paragraph 0061).

Further, Mukherjee discloses an invocation sequence specifying an order in
which the update functions are invoked, comprising the step of identifying, using the
synthesizer, trigger questions from the questions of the questionnaire that trigger the
invocation of at least one supplied update function (Figures 3A-3L; column 2, line 19-
column 3, line 5). Based upon a user's answer to trigger questions, various questions
are updated to become available/disabled. Determining that questions within the
sequence should be skipped based on being disabled constitutes determining an
updated invocation sequence by using an activation network. For these reasons, this
argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that the prior art fails to teach a document
generation system where update valued associated with questions in a questionnaire
form are used to obtain information to produce the customized document from a
template document (page 17). The examiner respectfully disagrees. Mukherjee
discloses a document generation system where update valued associated with
questions in a questionnaire form are used to obtain information to produce the
customized document from a template document (Figure 3A-3L and 4; column 2, line

19- column 3, line 5). In this instance, a user is presented with a plurality of questions

of a questionnaire form (Figures 3A-3L). Based upon the answers to the questions, a

document is generated (Figure 4; item 400b). For this reason, this argument is not

persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kyle R Stork/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Conferees:

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/William L. Bashore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175